

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JERIANNE KANE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

IXIA HOLDINGS, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:20-cv-01805-DAD-JLT

ORDER STAYING CASE PENDING NINTH  
CIRCUIT RULING

YASMIN CHILDS,

Plaintiff,

v.

IXIA HOLDINGS, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:20-cv-01806-DAD-JLT

ORDER STAYING CASE PENDING NINTH  
CIRCUIT RULING

KIRSTEN HAYE,

Plaintiff,

v.

IXIA HOLDINGS, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:20-cv-01810-DAD-JLT

ORDER STAYING CASE PENDING NINTH  
CIRCUIT RULING

1           The above-captioned matters are state-law actions concerning nursing homes' responses  
2 to the coronavirus pandemic. They were initially filed in California state courts and were  
3 subsequently removed to this U.S. District Court on the basis of federal-question jurisdiction.  
4 The notice of removal in each case asserts, among other things, that the state law causes of action  
5 are preempted by the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 247d-6d  
6 and 247d-6e (2006) (the "PREP Act"). Plaintiffs in each action have filed a motion to remand.

7           On October 21, 2021, the Ninth Circuit held oral argument in *Saldana v. Glenhaven*  
8 *Healthcare LLC*, No. 20-56194. According to the opening brief, the issues presented to the Ninth  
9 Circuit for review in *Saldana* were as follows:

- 10           1. Did the district court err in its interpretation and application of  
11           the federal officer removal statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1), by failing  
12           to recognize that Defendants' response to the pandemic was at the  
13           specific direction of, and to assist, the federal government, such that  
14           Defendants were "acting under" a federal officer as contemplated by  
15           § 1442(a)(1) and *Watson v. Philip Morris Cos.*, 551 U.S. 142 (2007)?
- 16           2. Did the district court err in its interpretation of the PREP Act's  
17           complete preemptive effect by failing to construe the various  
18           components of the PREP Act together?
- 19           3. Did the district court err in failing to recognize that Plaintiffs'  
20           state claims raise embedded federal issues pursuant to *Grable & Sons*  
21           *Metal Products v. Darue Engineering & Manufacturing*, 545 U.S.  
22           308 (2005) that compel granting federal jurisdiction because of the  
23           need for uniformity in the interpretation and enforcement of federal  
24           law in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic, which has affected  
25           every state in the country?

26           *Saldana*, Doc. No. 16, at 17–18.


27           The parties in the above-captioned matters have briefed similar issues. (See *Kane*, Doc.  
28 No. 21 (in opposition to motion to remand, making arguments concerning PREP Act, *Grable*, and  
federal officer statute); *Childs*, Doc. No. 19 (similar); *Haye*, Doc. No. 18 (similar) *Roccaro*, Doc.  
No. 1 (similar, in notice of removal).) Given the pending appeal before the Ninth Circuit, the  
court ordered the parties to show cause why these actions should not be stayed until the Ninth  
Circuit issues its decision in *Saldana* may be warranted. The parties were afforded fourteen days  
to respond to the order to show cause. No party responded or otherwise objected to the entry of a  
stay.

1           The court finds there is good cause for a stay given the procedural posture of *Saldana*  
2 because the outcome of *Saldana* may narrow the issues presented in the above-captioned cases.  
3 Therefore, a stay will conserve judicial and party resources. *See Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S.  
4 248, 254 (1936) (“[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every  
5 court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for  
6 itself, for counsel, and for litigants.”); *see also CMAX, Inc. v. Hall*, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir.  
7 1962) (when deciding whether to grant a stay, a court must consider factors such as “the possible  
8 damage which may result from the granting of a stay, the hardship or inequity which a party may  
9 suffer in being required to go forward, and the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the  
10 simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law which could be expected to  
11 result from a stay”). As no party objects to the stay, no prejudice or harm is apparent on this  
12 record.

13           Accordingly, the above-captioned cases are stayed pending the issuance of a ruling in  
14 *Saldana*. Fourteen days following the entry of the mandate by the Ninth Circuit resolving  
15 *Saldana*, the parties are directed to file either a stipulation regarding the lifting of the stay and  
16 setting forth appropriate deadlines or a joint status report indicating their respective positions on  
17 further proceedings.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19           Dated: December 15, 2021

  
20           \_\_\_\_\_  
21           UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28